



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,439	11/01/2001	Lawrence Koved	AUS920010941US	3558

35525 7590 09/22/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/002,439

Applicant(s)

KOVED ET AL.

Examiner

Kaveh Abrishamkar

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

RD

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on June 29, 2005. Claims 1-22 were originally received for consideration. Per the received amendment, claims 1,11, and 21 were amended. Claims 1-30 are currently being considered.

Terminal Disclaimer

2. The terminal disclaimer filed on June 29,2005 has been reviewed and is accepted, and therefore obviates the provisional double-patenting rejection over application No. 10/002,448. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed June 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claims 1,11, and 21, the applicant argues that the CPA, Gong (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,377), does not teach "determining if a superclass permission of a required permission is present in each protection domain of an access control context, wherein the superclass permission is a super class of the required permission." This

argument is not found persuasive. The CPA discloses, “if every associated protection domain contains a permission object that represents a permission encompassing the required permission, then the requested action is authorized” (column 19 lines 26-30). The permission encompassing the required permission, is interpreted as being the superclass of the required permission, since it is the higher level (encompassing) permission. Furthermore, the applicant argues that the CPA does not teach “adding the required permission to a permission collection if the superclass permission of the required permission is present in each protection domain of the access control context.” This argument is not found persuasive. The CPA discloses a method that “adds a permission object to the set of permission objects contained in the PermissionCollection object” (column 12 lines 15-17). This PermissionCollection object is a superclass of the permission (column 12 lines 2-10), and therefore a required permission is added if the superclass is present in each protection domain of the access control context. Furthermore, the applicant argues that the CPA does not teach “granting access to the resource if the superclass permission of the required permission is present in each protection domain of the access control context.” This argument is not found persuasive. The CPA discloses “if every associated protection domain contains a permission object that represents a permission encompassing the required permission, then the requested action is authorized” (column 19 lines 26-35). This encompassing permission is interpreted as the superclass permission since it is a higher level permission. Regarding claim 5-6, the applicant argues that the CPA does not teach “creating anew permission collection and adding the required permission to the new

permission collection" and "includes adding any subclass permissions of the required permission to the new permission collection." This argument is not found persuasive.

The CPA discloses "when a new category of permissions is desired, a new subclass is created" (column 19 lines 36-38), which is creating a new permission collection.

Furthermore, the CPA teaches "the particular rules or policy that govern whether the permissions granted a principal are encompassed by permission in the new category are implemented in the validation method of the new subclass representing permissions in the new subclass" (column 19 lines 38-43), which includes all the subset permissions according to the superclass permission. Regarding claim 9, 19, and 29 the applicant argues that the CPA does not teach an "that the determining step and the adding step are performed by a method called by the required permission in response to an implies method operating on the required permission." This argument is not found persuasive. The implies method is well-known in Java, and functions as if a superclass permission is allowed, then its subset permissions are allowed. This is viewed as being analogous to the superclass being present in the protection domain of an access control context as disclosed in claim 1. The CPA discloses, "'if every associated protection domain contains a permission object that represents a permission encompassing the required permission, then the requested action is authorized" (column 19 lines 26-30). The permission encompassing the required permission, is interpreted as being the superclass of the required permission, since it is the higher level (encompassing) permission.

The rejection for the claims are respectfully maintained as given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gong (U.S. Patent 6,047,377).

Regarding claim 1, Gong discloses:

A method of controlling access to computer system resources based on permissions, comprising:

“receiving a request for access to a computer system resource” (Figure 7 item 750, column 6 lines 36-46, column 18 line 29 – column 19 line 36);

“determining if a superclass permission of a required permission is present in each protection domain of an access control context, wherein the superclass permission is a super class of the required permission” (column 6 lines 36-46, column 18 lines 29-45);

“adding the required permission to a permission collection if the superclass permission of the required permission is present in each protection domain of the access control context” (column 17 lines 1-5, column 19 lines 37-43);
and

“granting access to the resource if the superclass permission of the required permission is present in each protection domain of the access control context” (column 10 lines 59-67, column 19 lines 4-36).

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein ***“the request is received from the bytecode”*** (column 13 line 63 – column 14 line 6).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses:

The method of claim 1, further comprising:

“determining the required permission based on a CodeSource associated with the request” (column 14 lines 28-36, column 15 lines 65-67); and

“determining the superclass permission of the required permission based on the required permission” (column 6 lines 36-46, column 18 lines 29-45).

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses;

The method of claim 1, wherein determining if a superclass permission of a required permission is present in each protection domain includes ***“determining if at least one permission collection in each protection domain includes the superclass permission”*** (column 6 lines 36-46, column 18 lines 29-45).

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein adding the required permission to a permission collection includes “***creating a new permission collection and adding the required permission to the new permission collection***” (column 16 line 56 – column 17 line 13).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses:

The method of claim 5, wherein adding the required permission to a permission collection further includes “***adding any subclass permissions of the required permission to the new permission collection***” (column 16 line 56 – column 17 line 13).

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses;

The method of claim 1, further comprising “***retrieving the access control context for a thread of execution that sent the request for access to the computer system resource***” (column 17 lines 36-64).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein adding the required permission to a permission collection includes “***adding the permission to a permission collection associated with the superclass permission***” (column 16 line 56 – column 17 line 13).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gong discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein the steps of determining if a superclass permission of a required permission is present in each protection domain of an access control context, and adding the required permission to a permission collection if the superclass permission of the required permission is present in each protection domain of an access control context are "***performed by a method called by the required permission in response to an implied method operating on the required permission***" (column 7 lines 30-45).

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 3. Furthermore, Gong discloses:

The method of claim 3, wherein the steps of determining the required permission based on a CodeSource associated with the request and determining the superclass permission of the required permission based on the required permission are "***performed based on a security policy file***" (Figure 4 item 444, column 13 lines 59 – 65).

6. Claims 11 – 20 are computer program product claims analogous to the method claims rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.

7. Claims 21 – 30 are apparatus claims analogous to the method claims rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 703-305-8892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cell
Primary Examiner
AU 2131
9/18/05

KA
09/17/2005